

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/734,834 12/11/2000		Jacek Szyszko	10559-369001 / P10175	4725
20985	7590 02/09/2006	)2/09/2006		XAMINER
FISH & RIC P.O. BOX 102	CHARDSON, PC		TRAN, ELLEN C	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		2134	<del></del> ·

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Commence	09/734,834	SZYSZKO, JACEK			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Ellen C. Tran	2134			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	l. lety filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
<ul> <li>1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 No.</li> <li>2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This</li> <li>3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E</li> </ul>	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	vn from consideration.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the bedrewing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 09/734,834 Page 2

Art Unit: 2134

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communication: amendment filed 14 November 2005, with original application filed 11 December 2000.

2. Claims 1-30 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, 14, 20, 25, 27, and 29 are independent claims.

## Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are moot due to new grounds of rejection.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li U.S. Patent No. 6,606,706 (hereinafter '706) in further view of OSPF version 2, RFC 2328, published 1998 (hereinafter OSPF).

As to independent claim 1, "A method of transmitting routing information comprising: sending a first message" is taught in '706 col. 3, lines 64-67;

"and a digest of routing information" is shown in '706 col. 10, lines 6-13;

Art Unit: 2134

"that has been calculated using a first authentication key" is disclosed in '706 col. 11, lines 27-33;

"and subsequently sending a second message" and "that is earlier in a sequence than the first sequence identifier and a digest of the routing information that has been calculated using a second authentication key" is taught in '706 col.

11, lines 52-67;

"wherein the second sequence identifier is sequentially related to the first sequence identifier" is disclosed in '706 col. 12, lines 8-16 (Note the second message is interpreted to be have the same meaning as 'multicast announcement').

the following is not taught in '706 "containing a first sequence identifier" and "containing a second sequence identifier" however OSPF teaches in 12.1.6. "LS sequence number The sequence number field is a signed 32-bit integer. It is used to detect old and duplicate LSAs" on page 120 (Note The receiver then need only check this sequence number to determine whether or not the received packed is a retransmission. The sequence number is used in Li when the security broker keeps transmitting the request until it receives replies from all security domain border routers col. 12, lines 8-16.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of '706 a security system with border routers to utilize sequence numbers when transmitting messages. One in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification when using routing protocols such as OSPF (see '706 col. 3, lines 64-67) "In one embodiment of the present invention, security

Application/Control Number: 09/734,834

Art Unit: 2134

domains are defined in accordance with routing domains defined by any one of a number of well known routing protocols such as OSPF".

As to dependent claim 2, "wherein each authentication key has a specified lifetime and the lifetime of the second key expires prior to the lifetime of the first key" is disclosed in '706 col. 11, lines 49-64.

As to dependent claim 3, "wherein the first key is valid only following an authentication key rollover and the second key was valid at a time prior to the authentication key rollover" is taught in '706 col. 11 lines 49-64.

As to dependent claim 4, "determining whether neighboring routers have successfully performed the authentication key rollover and sending both the first and second messages only if it is determined that at least one neighboring router has not yet successfully performed the authentication key rollover" is shown in '706 col. 12, lines 7-16.

As to dependent claim 5, "including sending only the first message if the first message forms part of a routing information advertisement that is the first such advertisement transmitted by the router after the authentication key rollover" is disclosed in '706 col. 12, lines 7-16.

As to dependent claim 6, "including sending only the first message if it is determined that all neighboring routers have successfully performed the authentication key rollover" is taught in '706 col. 12, lines 26-28.

As to dependent claim 7, "including: receiving the first and second messages in a particular neighboring router; and processing, in the particular

Application/Control Number: 09/734,834

Art Unit: 2134

neighboring router, only the digest contained in the first message" is shown in '706 col. 10, lines 53 through col. 11, line 27.

As to dependent claim 8, "wherein the first sequence identifier comprises a number greater than the second sequence number" is disclosed in '706 col. 13, lines 25-57.

As to independent claim 9, this claim is directed to a router of the method of claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 10, 11, 12, and 13, these claims are substantially similar to dependent claims 6, 3, 5, 8; therefore they are rejected along the same rationale.

As to independent claim 14, "A computer system comprising: a plurality of computer networks; a first router interconnecting at least some of the computer networks; and neighboring routers coupled to the first router wherein the first router is configured for periodically sending respective first and second messages to one or more of the neighboring routers" is taught in '706 col. 3, lines 64-67 (Note the OSPF protocol designates that LSA messages are sent periodically to update routing information);

"and for sending the first message prior to the second message" and "a digest of routing information that has been calculated using a first authentication key" is disclosed in '706 col. 11, lines 27-33;

"wherein the first message contains a first sequence identifier" and "and wherein the second message contains a second sequence identifier" is shown in OSPF page 120;

"that is earlier in a sequence than the first sequence identifier and a digest of the routing information that has been calculated using a second authentication key" is taught in '706 col. 11, lines 52-67.

As to dependent claims 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19; these claims are substantially similar to dependent claims 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8; therefore they are rejected along the same rationale.

As to independent claim 20, this claim is directed to a computer-readable medium of the method of claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 21-24; these claims are substantially similar to dependent claims 2-8; therefore they are rejected along the same rationale.

As to independent claim 25, "A method for use in connection with a router comprising: receiving in the router a first message" is taught in '706 col. 3, lines 64-67;

"and a digest of routing information" is shown in '706 col. 10, lines 6-13;

"that has been calculated using a first authentication key" is disclosed in '706 col. 11, lines 27-33;

"containing a first sequence identifier" and "subsequently receiving in the router a second message containing a second sequence identifier" is taught in OSPF on page 120;

"that is earlier in a sequence than the first sequence identifier and a digest of the routing information that has been calculated using a second authentication key" is taught in '706 col. 11, lines 52-67;

"and processing the first message using the first authentication key and discarding the second message without processing routing information contained therein if the router has successfully performed an authentication key rollover from the second key to the first key" is shown in '706 col. 11, lines 21-25 and '706 col. 12, lines 7-16;

"wherein the second sequence identifier is sequentially related to the first sequence identifier" is disclosed in '706 col. 12, lines 8-16.

As to dependent claim 26, "including processing the second message using the second key only if the router has not successfully performed the authentication key rollover" is disclosed in "706 col. 12, lines 8-16.

As to independent claim 27, this claim is directed to a router of the method of claim 25 and is rejected along the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 28, this claim is substantially similar to dependent claim 26 and is rejected along the same rationale.

As to independent claim 29, this claim is directed to a computer-readable medium of the method of claim 25 and is rejected along the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 30, this claim is substantially similar to dependent claim 26 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Application/Control Number: 09/734,834 Page 8

Art Unit: 2134

### Conclusion

6. The following prior art has been considered but not utilized in this Office Action

Hardjono U.S. Patent No. 6.,301,662

Issued Oct 9, 2001

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Ellen C Tran whose telephone number is

(571) 272-3842. The examiner can normally be reached from 6:00 am to 2:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on (571) 272-3799. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ellen. Tran
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2134
3 February 2006

GILBERTO BARRON JA.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100